

SELF-HATRED AND JEWISH CHAUVINISM

Some Reflections on "Positive Jewishness"

CLEMENT GREENBERG

ONE looks into oneself and discovers there what is also in others. A realization of the Jewish self-hatred in myself, of its subtlety and the devious ways in which it conceals itself, from me as well as from the world outside, explains many things that used to puzzle me in the behavior of my fellow Jews. I do not think that in this respect I am projecting upon others faults I find in myself; it is only reluctantly that I have become persuaded that self-hatred in one form or another is almost universal among Jews—or at least much more prevalent than is commonly thought or admitted—and that it is not confined on the whole to Jews like myself.

The term "self-hatred" was first applied to what is better defined as the Jewish inferiority complex—which is, strictly speaking, more self-doubt and self-contempt than actual self-hatred—by the late Theodor Lessing, a German Jewish writer, in a rather unsatisfactory book on the subject called *Der Jüdische Selbsthass* which was published in the late 20's. The social causes of this self-hatred were dealt with more satisfactorily by the late Kurt

THE Jewish "inferiority complex" is customarily regarded as a phenomenon of assimilationism. CLEMENT GREENBERG, who has been associate editor of COMMENTARY since its founding, thinks otherwise, and in this self-searching personal essay argues that "self-hatred" is a problem for almost every Jew in our society, and not least for those who most clamantly affirm their "positive Jewishness." Critically examining solutions currently offered to ease the heart of self-blame, failure, or insecurity growing out of inferior status, he indicates the direction in which he believes the remedy lies. Mr. Greenberg was born in New York City in 1909, was brought up in Norfolk, Va., and Brooklyn, and received his college education at Syracuse University. He was formerly an editor of *Partisan Review* and art critic of the *Nation*. His book on Joan Miró, the Catalan painter, was published in 1948.

Lewin, a sociologist who came to America from Germany, in an article that appeared in the *Contemporary Jewish Record* of June 1941 under the title "Self-Hatred Among Jews." Dr. Lewin wrote then: "It is recognized in sociology that the members of the lower social strata tend to accept the fashions, values, and ideals of the higher strata. In the case of the underprivileged group it means that their opinions about themselves are greatly influenced by the low esteem the majority has for them. This . . . heightens the tendency of the Jew with a negative balance [i.e., the Jew who finds his identity as a Jew too much of a psychological handicap] to cut himself loose from things Jewish. . . . Being unable to cut himself entirely loose from his Jewish connections and his Jewish past, the hatred turns upon himself. . . ."

This states the case well enough as far as my own experience is concerned. But when Dr. Lewin suggests that "A strong feeling of being part and parcel of the group and having a positive attitude toward it is, for children and adults alike, the sufficient condition for the avoidance of attitudes based on self-hatred," he reveals that he did not go any further inside the problem than was required in order to describe it. He saw the signs of self-hatred too exclusively in an outwardly negative attitude toward fellow Jews and things Jewish, and took the absence of self-hatred for granted wherever a Jew made no bones about his "group belongingness" and accepted his Jewish connections. It does not seem so simple as that to me. Nor, perhaps, was it really so simple as that for Dr. Lewin. Otherwise he would not have reasoned in a circle.

If to have a positive attitude toward the group is *ipso facto* to be without self-hatred, the positiveness is the result of the cure, not, as Dr. Lewin suggested, its means. Nor, for

that matter, is feeling "part and parcel of the group" such a sure antidote. The pressure of the larger society within which we live, according to whose traditions the Jews as a whole do not cut an attractive figure (have we not been, as Felix Frankfurter says, "the most vilified and persecuted minority in history"?), is far too strong to enable one to escape self-hatred simply by feeling oneself 100 per cent Jewish. On the contrary, such a feeling may even increase self-hatred. The pressure of the opinions of the larger society reaches everywhere, even into theological seminaries, and one may well resent oneself all the more for sensing oneself undilutedly Jewish.

THE CRUX of the difficulty presented by self-hatred, as it affects the American Jew, lies in the different ways that it is acted out. The "negative" Jew, fleeing his Jewishness, expresses his self-hatred directly, even if he rationalizes it in some cases by maintaining that there is really no other difference than that of religion between himself and Gentiles (forgetting that he is quite aware that there is more than a religious difference between Anglo-Saxon and, for instance, Irish Gentiles). Or, in other cases, he may express his self-hatred even more openly by admitting that he dislikes Jews and things Jewish even though he is a Jew himself; then he will argue, most likely, that he is not like other Jews and therefore hasn't enough Jewishness in himself to cause him to feel self-hatred. Either way the self-hatred is not diminished, for all the directness with which it is expressed, and remains to corrode one's character. And it is compounded by a lie—namely, that Jewishness is a mere accidental detail, or that the Jew in question is less "Jewish" than other Jews. (No matter how much he may repeat this lie to himself, no Jew ever succeeds in believing it, whence stems that hidden anguish which is present in so many "inauthentic," genteel, and Gentilized Jews—the anguish, that is, of not being able to believe something one wants very much to.)

The "positive" or "affirmative" Jew is supposedly the opposite of this kind of Jew. Ap-

parently, he, the "positive" Jew, has no self-hatred to express; he asserts, seeks out, and revels in his Jewishness. The question then is, ought his behavior be accepted at face value? Does he mean it all the way down? Was he free from self-hatred to start with? Or, if not, did he succeed in dealing with it in such a way that he became entirely free of it? If the latter is the case, then Jews like myself must sit at his feet and learn from him.

But what do I see when I take a longer look? That the Jewishness of so many of these "positive" Jews is truculent, and very sensitive to criticism; that it is also aggressive and uncharitable; that it points to itself too challengingly and has too little patience with conceptions of Jewishness other than its own; that it is too prone to polemical violence and name-calling; that, in the end, it faces outward too much and seems to get too little satisfaction from its own self. Were these "positive" Jews really and truly in possession of themselves as Jews, would they not be more at ease—even a little complacent? It is this absence of ease that makes me suspect that a certain familiar psychological mechanism is at work here. By projecting it upon others and attacking it violently in others, these "positive" Jews may be exorcising from their own consciousness an image of the Jew that is no less "negative" than that in the mind of the most cringing "assimilationist."*

II

"POSITIVE JUDAISM" has been with us for quite a while now, but it has not yet succeeded in persuading me that it is more than a circumlocutory name for a new phase of Jewish nationalism in which it becomes more like other nationalisms, to the point of being infected with chauvinism.

Chauvinism, or rabid nationalism, history

*Witness, for example, that innocent and lamentable delight with which so many "affirmative" Jews call attention to the prevalence of blondness and blue eyes among the Israeli youth. The phenomenon has been noted with the greatest satisfaction in precisely the most nationalist Jewish magazines and books. Yet we are always quite sure that the high value the American Negro puts on a light complexion is a symptom of his self-hatred.

tells us, is a means usually of compensating for a sense of collective inadequacy or failure. As a sentiment shared by responsible people, it does not appear among nations that have enjoyed a successful history; thus it is not customarily associated with the national feelings of Americans and most Western European peoples. It is among the oppressed, frustrated, or backward peoples of Central and Eastern Europe that it has been most virulent. There we find Germans asserting Germanism, Russians Slavism, Magyars Magyarism, Lithuanians Lithuanianism as absolute ends in themselves and not needing generalization in terms of any broader value in order to be made the supreme criteria of all things on earth and in heaven. There we also find that self-consciousness about national traits which is preoccupied with determining, as the case may be, what is uniquely German or Russian, who is German or Russian, what makes Germans or Russians superior to all others, how one can go about becoming more German or Russian, and so forth.

We Jews have known something of this kind of self-preoccupation for a long time, albeit without nationalism, and while it often betrays the fact that we simply find ourselves more interesting than Gentiles, it is also the symptom of a collective feeling of self-doubt. But the self-doubt has, usually, to become general and very uncomfortable before it can furnish the fuel for chauvinism, and it is also necessary for the people concerned to have had some first taste of success.

It is with its first taste of success that a people musters up the nerve to begin actively compensating for its sense of inferiority—usually by arrogance and self-praise. Yet it continues to feel itself in the position of an upstart and is still afraid that it won't be treated with sufficient respect. Along with this goes a suspicion that the success was accidental and unearned anyhow, and one has to discover virtues in oneself that prove the opposite and quiet the suspicion. Certainly chauvinism has nothing to do with self-confidence or a truly "positive attitude" toward one's group. German nationalism became widely chauvinist only after the Franco-Prus-

sian War, and the Germans still had—and have—one of the deepest inferiority complexes of any territorially unified people. It is not for nothing that Goethe, Thomas Mann, and others have seen similarities between the inner attitudes of Germans and Jews.

HOWEVER real or unreal these similarities may be, some of the parallels that have appeared between Jewish and German nationalism—especially the post-1918 variety of the latter—cannot at all be written off as "literature." This, no matter how painful I, as a Jew, find any resemblance between German nationalism and things Jewish: which is all the more reason why Jewish chauvinism is distressing to contemplate. Nor is the possibility of these parallels decreased by the fact that there are many similarities in the pattern of the rise itself of the two nationalisms. Like the German, Jewish nationalism was born of a history of humiliation and defeat, and required a sharp blow or succession of blows in order to be awakened to action: the pogroms of czarist Russia and the growth of secular and doctrinaire anti-Semitism were for us what subjection to Napoleon was to the Germans. The decisive shock, without which Jewish nationalism might still have remained the province largely of East European Jewish intellectuals, was Hitler's destruction of six millions of us, which has been the equivalent (and much, much more) of what the 1918 defeat was for the Germans. However, the victory in Palestine did for us *after* our disaster what their defeat of France in 1870 had done for the Germans *before* their disaster: it gave us a first taste of real success, of success won on our own. And it is only since then, apparently, that Jewish chauvinism has become a serious possibility.

Are we to fold our hands and resign ourselves to Jewish chauvinism with the excuse that the same historical factors that produced chauvinism in other peoples cannot be prevented from doing so in Jews and that we might as well bow our heads to necessity? The necessity is not pleasant, especially when we see how much like German chauvinism the Jewish variety can be. Is not Jewish iden-

tity, as a mere fact, being made a primary virtue, as the Germans made their German-ness one? Is not a "Jewishness" defined almost entirely in terms of group loyalty and group conformity, and whose only content is its function as differentiation, being elevated as the supreme criterion by which everything and every Jew is to be judged? Worst of all, have not some of us become too quick to hate and too intemperate in our abuse of fellow Jews who disagree with us?

CHAUVINISM has had a fairly long history by now, long enough to make us all familiar with its practical liabilities as well as its purely aesthetic uglinesses. And one might expect that, in spite of the historical factors that encourage it among us, we Jews might have become immunized to it by all the suffering it has caused us at the hands of other people. But even if this expectation is bound to be disappointed since human beings are what they are, surely a people as literate and rational as we should not at this late date be deceived by our own chauvinism. We should be able to recognize that it no more denies a collective inferiority complex in our case than it has in that of other peoples.*

Actually, chauvinism—which in America means Jewish separatism—intensifies self-hatred by concealing and dissembling it, by sinking it into depths of the psyche where it becomes all the more malignant because out of sight. Remaining invisible, retreating at most, but not disappearing, self-hatred prompts us to go to ever greater lengths to convince ourselves that we have extirpated it—to strut and posture and boast. We become too prone to violent words if not violent deeds. Yet we succeed no better than before in coming to terms with ourselves, and only exchange one expression of self-hatred

for another, more indirect and deceptive one.

III

BUT I do not wish to argue that the self-hatred which the "positive" Jew hides is exactly the same as that which the "negative," furtive Jew reveals. The "positive" Jew and his spiritual ancestors do, after all, embody the Jewish group consciousness more than do most other Jews. The "positive" Jew has accepted the burden as well as the rewards involved in that. He fights as best he knows how for Jewish self-respect, and whatever he wins redounds to the benefit of all other Jews.

I am aware, moreover, of all that in Jewish history would justify an excessive nationalism on our part. The attitude of the non-Jewish world—the chief cause of our self-hatred—provides a strong practical as well as psychological argument for the uses of a Jewish national selfishness. Those of us who are sick of Europe after Auschwitz and want to have nothing more to do with Gentiles have a right for the moment to indulge our feelings, if only to recover from the trauma. But humanity in general is still the highest value and not all Gentiles are anti-Semitic. Self-pity turned a good many Germans into swine, and it can do the same to others, regardless of how much their self-pity is justified. No matter how necessary it may be to indulge our feelings about Auschwitz, we can do so only temporarily and privately; we certainly cannot let them determine Jewish policy either in Israel or outside it.

Like the spokesmen of national consciousness everywhere, most nationalist Jews want above all else power for their people, or at least the show of power. And who can say that they are not justified? Power is essential at least insofar as it means being able to take more of our fate into our own hands instead of suffering it as passive objects. Yet the nationalist tends to accept too implicitly the decisions rendered by power.

It is precisely because of his sensitivity to questions of power that the self-hatred of the nationalist Jew has been greatly aggravated by the scale and mode in which Hitler slaughtered us. The nationalist Jew wants

*"Among Negro—and Jewish—school children, it has been found, those who recognize their minority status most clearly are also those who feel most ashamed of the low status of their group; in them 'group pride' and 'self-hatred' seem inextricably mixed."—From a review by Miriam Reimann of Arnold Rose's book *The Negro's Morale: Group Identification and Protest* that appeared in the October COMMENTARY.

more *from*, as well as for, his people in the way of self-reliance and force, and feels humiliated by the ease with which the Nazis were able to kill most of our six millions. And he cannot help fearing, whatever his reason may tell him, that the scale and, even more, the mode of that slaughter were somehow a judgment upon us. Unlike the "negative" Jew, however, who may fear the same thing, he does not flee the whole question and try to wipe it from his mind by pretending that he is not like other Jews and so does not have to regard the fate of the six millions as in any way a judgment on himself. He remains identified and he remains with his fear and shame, to struggle with them as best he can. The trouble is that he, of all Jews, is the one least equipped to think through the problem.

It is, of course, more than time that we all began to make a real effort to digest the fact of Auschwitz psychologically, if only to eliminate a source of self-hatred that—unlike its other sources—is not deeply rooted in the fabric of the larger American society that surrounds us. But if the "positive" Jews don't want to start the necessary discussion, none of us others seems to want to either. Not only is the mind unable to come to terms with the dimensions of the event and so resolve some of its oppressiveness, and not only does it prefer to remain numbed in order to spare itself the pain; as I have just said, the mind has a tendency, deep down, to look on a calamity of that order as a punishment that must have been deserved. How could it have happened, on that scale and in that way, if it were not? But why deserved? For what? The mind doesn't know, but it fears—fears in an utterly irrational and amoral, if not immoral, way that we were punished for being unable to take the risk of defending ourselves. No moral considerations enter in, as there used to, to relieve our feelings when we were persecuted; we were not punished by God for having transgressed—for no people could have sinned enough against any moral code to draw down such a punishment from any just God. We were punished by history, and, given the extent to which we, and especially

the nationalists among us, accept the standards of judgment upon which all the world acts, the recognition that history usually punishes people only for being helpless does not diminish the shame involved. Disaster becomes punishment, and punishment proves that one is inferior because one is not able to avert it. (André Gide says somewhere that the French too tend to feel that their defeat, in 1940, has made them morally guilty.)

The rise of a militant, aggressive Jewish nationalism is in large part an answer to this state of mind. There are, I repeat, other than psychological reasons to justify Jewish militancy in this period, but I think we really feel the psychological ones as more urgent. We have to show the world and ourselves that "Jews can fight." Whether we shall ever succeed in proving this to our own satisfaction I don't know. But to behave like chauvinists and view the matter wholly in terms of physical aggressiveness won't do it. The main struggle, at least for us in America, still has to be fought inside ourselves. It is there, and only there, that we can convince ourselves that Auschwitz, while it may have been a historical judgment, was not a verdict upon our intrinsic worth as a people. Exactly how we can do this I am not competent to say, but I do know that it has to be done, and that in order to do it we shall have to be much franker with ourselves about self-hatred—and other things—than hitherto.

JEWISH militancy has its enlightened as well as its obscurantist side, nevertheless, and I myself am all for applying a measure of militancy here as well as in Israel. Modern anti-Semitism, being what it is, gathers momentum instead of expending itself when it goes unresisted beyond a certain point. I believe that it is best coped with in this country, once that point is reached, by direct personal action on the part of individual Jews, and it would be all to the good if our new Jewish nationalism could move us to take such matters as Joe McWilliams into our own hands instead of calling the policeman. I also believe that this would contribute importantly to the lessening of our self-hatred.

Then it's a question of dealing with anti-Semites by individual force? It is—and more. It is also a question of releasing that pent-up, frightened, and festering aggressiveness which supplies the fuel for rabid nationalism, and shifting the emphasis of militancy from the mass, where it runs the danger of becoming chauvinist and irresponsible, to the individual. Jewishness, insofar as it has to be asserted in a predominantly Gentile world, should be a personal rather than mass manifestation, and more a matter of individual self-reliance. This does not mean overlooking one's responsibility to one's fellow Jews, but it does mean making Jewishness something other than a product of herd warmth and an occasion for that herd conformity out of which arise the ugliest manifestations of nationalism—as we saw in the German case.

As a herd manifestation, nationalism becomes a means of enslaving rather than of liberating the group. The herd elevates mediocrities into positions of power and influence, for only mediocrity can express it to its own satisfaction. The abuse that some "positive" Jews—rabbis, journalists, and others—are so ready to turn upon fellow Jews who refuse to make a fetish of their, the "positive" Jews', conception of Jewishness, is, among other things, a symptom of the kind of jealous fear felt by ambitious mediocrity, as it is also of a secret self-hatred. Only mediocrities, or people with hidden guilt, react so violently—and often irrelevantly—to criticism and dissent.

The East European background of most of the present leaders and spokesmen of Jewish nationalism is another factor that tends to exaggerate it. They cannot, in their political function, wholly escape the effects of the backward environment in which they grew up. Politics in Eastern and also Central Europe was involved primarily with ethnic issues and therefore encouraged national fanaticism. At the same time the only counterpoise to the disorder of a decaying feudal society was, and apparently still is, regimentation. The social responsibility that the individual has learned to assume as a matter of course in the West is there incul-

cated, it would appear, only by mass organizations and factional discipline. I can understand why there are "marching youth" in Israel, and party uniforms, and why loyalty to a political party often competes with loyalty to the state. These stigmata of political backwardness will probably not disappear until Eastern Europe becomes a less vivid memory, the Oriental Jews are successfully absorbed, and Israel herself has enjoyed a security like America's or Britain's or Switzerland's for a generation. But to understand is still not to assent.

Specifically Jewish political activity in this country is open to the same influences, since most of those who are "Jewishly" politically conscious among us come from Eastern Europe too, or have been formed by fathers and mothers who did. This, however, has not been enough to secure the regimentation of Jewish political life in America because, fortunately, our larger society is advanced and solid enough to overcome transplanted backwardness in less than a generation. We do not have to pick our way through the wreckage and poverty of a dying feudal society; we do not live in ethnic enclaves; here bourgeois enlightenment has become a good deal of an official reality, and we are citizens rather than nationals. And most of us, Jews and Gentiles, are urbanized. This is why so much of what goes as Jewish political and cultural thought in this country—cultural autonomy on Mordecai M. Kaplan's model and ethnic-plus-religious separatism on Abba Hillel Silver's*—is so utterly irrelevant to the lives actually led by American Jews—even more irrelevant than the imported Bolshevism of the 30's, another product of the political backwardness of Eastern Europe, was to the lives of Americans in general. This is

*Rabbi Silver castigates the editors and writers of this magazine (without actually naming it) as "uprooted intellectuals" (*The Day*, July 16, 1950). I should like to remind the Rabbi that the term "uprooted intellectual" has been and is a favorite in the totalitarian (and anti-Semitic) lexicon of abuse, from Mussolini and Hitler to Stalin, and that wherever we hear it we can be sure that we shall also hear demagoguery and obscurantism. (And, incidentally, what is it that Rabbi Silver is "rooted" in?)

why "positive Judaism" and all the other varieties of Jewish nationalism still remain nothing but fuel for oratory and journalism.

IV

WHAT the "positive" Jews have been unable to do so far is show us how the Jewish consciousness and Jewish belongingness they invoke would affect the texture and fiber of our lives as we live them in New York, Detroit, and Dallas. We know from experience how observance of the 613 prescriptions would change them, but the "positive" Jews appear to mean more than that—and less. One can be a rigidly Orthodox Jew and still be as exposed as any other American to the effects of our machine-made culture; one can still rotate from Canasta to the movies, from the radio to the television set, from over-shopping to over-eating, even if there is time out on Saturday. The "positive" Jews want to urge something more on us. I applaud them for the desire but still wish to see them become more relevant and hear phrases that are less empty come from their mouths. They still do not confront our lives honestly and from any other fundamental standpoint than the abstract and basically irrelevant one of institutionalism and politics. Nor, worst of all, do they confront themselves and recognize their own variety of "negative" Jewishness. They still say nothing, therefore, to those other Jews like myself, who make no claim to being "positive" and know that we suffer from insecurity as Jews.

What we might ask of our new Jewish self-consciousness is that it liberate rather than organize us—liberate us from the pressure of that kind of self-consciousness which weakens us as individuals because it makes us define ourselves too much in terms of the group, whether positively or negatively. In so doing we do violence to ourselves as personalities and interfere with that self-realization which I conceive as one of the primary goals of human striving.

The ultra-assimilationist Jew does violence to himself as a human being pure and simple, as well as Jew, because he tries to make himself more typically English, French, or Ger-

man than any Anglo-Saxon, Gaul, or Teuton ever is. He over-defines himself, in group terms, in the effort to prove he is more English or French than Jewish—which means, really, that he always acts with reference to his Jewishness, even if it is an entirely negative reference. The nationalist Jew, too, always acts with reference to his Jewishness. But even though it is an ostensibly positive reference, by the too great strenuousness of his effort to assert his Jewishness he likewise over-defines himself in group terms. Both the assimilationist and the nationalist leave too little room for their native personalities. While there is no such thing as a human being in general, there is also no such thing as a complete Jew or a complete Englishman.

What I want to be able to do is accept my Jewishness more implicitly, so implicitly that I can use it to realize myself as a human being in my own right, and *as a Jew in my own right*. I want to feel free to be whatever I need to be and delight in being as a personality without being typed or prescribed to as a Jew or, for that matter, as an American. I am both Jew and American naturally, simply because I cannot help being them, having been born and brought up what I am. But I do not want to make any more issue of being a Jew—unless I am forced to by such things as anti-Semitism—than an enlightened Englishman makes of being English. And I want to overcome my self-hatred in order to be more myself, not in order to be a "good Jew." For I don't recognize "good Jews" any more than I do "good Americans," "good Englishmen," or "good Chinese." Nor do I feel that Jews who are "positively," nationalistically, or religiously Jewish are "better" Jews than I. I recognize only Jews who are more self-reliantly Jewish than myself and therefore more at one with themselves, and braver and more spontaneous.

But what about my responsibility to fellow Jews, I shall be asked—what about the Jewish community and Jewish survival? My relation to the Jewish community should be as much a personal and spontaneous expression of myself as anything else; that is, it should be a natural one and not legislated to

me by an ideology—not any more than my relation to the American community is. And my responsibility to fellow Jews is something taken for granted in the first place, and for a variety of reasons that do not have to be gone into here—and which hardly concern the self-hatred I want to get rid of.

As for Jewish survival, all I can say is that if we can survive only by all of us becoming nationalists, then we Jews have lost all justification for persisting as a group. I feel, however, that we shall persist as Jews, no matter how assimilated we become in our customs and manners, as long as Jewishness remains essential to our sense of our individual selves, as long as it is the truth about our individual selves. And we shall have a better chance of surviving “Jewishly” if the truth that is our Jewishness becomes one that we prefer rather than one that is felt as due only to an unfortunate “accident” of birth. Which the “positive” self-hating Jew feels to be just as much an accident as does the “negative” one. . . .

I SHOULD like to be more specific and concrete, but I cannot because I do not have the complete answer to self-hatred. The non-Jewish world, as long as it clings to its unfavorable notion of the Jew in general, will always make impossible the entire extirpation of self-hatred in the Diaspora.* All I claim is

that we can rid ourselves of a good deal of it, despite the world's attitude, by bringing it out into the open, and by becoming aware of what it causes us to do and say. Let us express our discomfort as Jews more directly, without falsifying it by an ineffective sublimation, as the “positive” Jew does, or by a spurious rationality or an equally spurious forgetfulness, as the “negative” Jew does. The sense of Jewish inferiority is there, but less of it will be there the moment we acknowledge it and begin to realize just how and where we act upon it. And the more we acknowledge it the less, I feel sure, we shall act upon it.

Until then no amount of Jewish education or programs for Jewish cultural endeavor will help very much. These tend to become means rather of evading and hiding the problem. For though they are designed to combat Jewish self-hatred, their sponsors are too afraid of naming it to know where to seek it out. We fool ourselves with fine-sounding phrases. The problem has to be focused directly in the individual Jew and discussed in personal, not communal, terms. For self-hatred is as intimate a thing as love.

*See in this connection an article by Yehezkel Kaufman, “Anti-Semitic Stereotypes in Zionism,” that appeared in English translation in the March 1949 COMMENTARY.